



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/343,464	06/30/1999	STEVEN M. BELLOVIN	2685/113031	7948

26652 7590 03/11/2004
AT&T CORP.
P.O. BOX 4110
MIDDLETOWN, NJ 07748

EXAMINER

FIELDS, COURTNEY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/343,464

Applicant(s)

BELLOVIN, STEVEN M.

Examiner

Courtney D. Fields

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A. SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-12,14-22 and 29-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-12,14-22 and 29-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2,4-12,14-22,and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams U.S. Patent No. 6,304,973 in view of Ichikawa et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,307,837. As per claims 1,11, and 21, Williams teaches a method for filtering packets using a policy to determine how to forward the packet. (See Column 15, lines 66-67, Column 16, lines 1-25) However, Williams fails to specifically teach verifying the first device (source address) that is included in the transferred packet. Ichikawa et al. teaches a method for packet transferring at the start of communication using a gateway to authenticate the identity of the remote terminal, and if it is found that the remote terminal has not been authorized, the packet is discarded. The remote terminal transmits a sender packet containing an encrypted destination address and an encrypted source address, to the gateway. The destination gateway retrieves the data from the received packet and decodes the packet. After confirming the authenticity of the remote terminal, an encrypted path is established between the gateway and the remote terminal to prevent fraudulent access to the data network. (See Column 2, lines 20-53)

As per claims 2 and 12, Williams as modified teaches comparing authenticated identifier by the step of authenticating to a list of identifiers, retrieving at least one policy rule relative to the authenticated identifier, determining whether to send the packet to the second device in accordance to the policy rule. (See Ichikawa et al., Column 8, lines 33-54, Column 9, lines 7-29)

As per claims 4 and 14, Williams as modified teaches authenticating in accordance with IPSEC standards. (See Williams, Column 11, lines 60-67)

As per claims 5,15, and 30, Williams as modified teaches retrieving security from authentication header, retrieving a key with security, and determining if packet is authentic using a key. (See Ichikawa et al., Column 11, lines 59-67, Column 12, lines 1-60)

As per claims 6 and 16, Williams as modified teaches the step of sending a message to a third device indicating that identifier is not authentic, when the step of authenticating so determines. (See Ichikawa et al., Column 18, lines 25-48)

As per claims 7,17, and 31, Williams as modified teaches having an IPSEC authentication header. (See Williams, Column 9, lines 36-41)

As per claims 8 and 18, Williams as modified teaches having an packet in addition encrypted and the method further comprises decrypting the packet before authenticating. (See Ichikawa et al., Column 9, lines 44-64)

As per claims 9 and 19, Williams as modified teaches encrypting and decrypting a packet by using DES and Triple-DES. (See Williams, Column 9, lines 21-28)

As per claims 10 and 20, Williams as modified teaches a policy rule stored in a file in a policy configuration file in a processing unit. (See Williams, Column 15, lines 28-57)

As per claim 22, Williams as modified teaches a second buffer for storing the compared data packet prior to forwarding the compared data packet to the second device. (See Ichiwaka et al., Column 13, lines 24-53)

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to improve security of transmitting packets by only allowing those that have been registered beforehand to access certain data networks.

Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since, a need exists for a secure method and system that supports data packets in a public network which prevents unauthorized usage.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ho, U.S. Patent No. 6,148,342 discloses a secure database system for encrypted identifiers and access request.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Courtney D. Fields whose telephone number is 703-305-8293. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu 7:00 - 5:00 pm; off every Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on 703-308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

COS
cdf

March 4, 2004

Gregory Morse

GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100